IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHARLES F. WARGO

NO: 13-cv-

٧.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CBRE, INC., and RICHARD

SCHLEICHER

CIVIL ACTION

COMPLAINT

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Charles F. Wargo ("Plaintiff" or "Wargo") is an adult male individual who resides in Birmingham, Alabama.
- 2. Defendant CBRE, Inc. ("CBRE") is a business corporation headquartered in Santa Monica, California and regularly doing business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania at Two Liberty Place, Suite 3000, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 3. CBRE has, at all times relevant, been an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce which employed in excess of twenty employees for every day in the calendar year.
- 4. Defendant Richard Schleicher ("Schleicher") is an adult individual who regularly conducts business at Two Liberty Place, Suite 3000, 50 South 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This is an action under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. §2000e, et. seq., the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA"), 29 U.S.C. §621 et seq., and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"), 43 P.S. §955 et seq.
- 6. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5, 29 U.S.C. §626(c)(1), 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1367.
- 7. Venue is proper in this district since the employment in question was located in this district and the acts giving rise to the claim occurred in this district, as required by 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5 and 28 U.S.C. §1391(b).

FACTS

- 8. Plaintiff was born in 1950.
- 9. Plaintiff was employed by CBRE from on or about March 2005 until February 28, 2012.
- 10. At all times during his employment with CBRE, Plaintiff was qualified for the job he held as Senior Real Estate Manager.
 - 11. Schleicher was the Plaintiff's direct supervisor beginning in 2006.
- 12. During the period between the start of his said supervision and August, 2010, Schleicher made several statements to Plaintiff to the effect that he (Plaintiff) would be retiring soon and that he did not know why Plaintiff wanted to work at his age, and that the "future of CBRE is with twenty and thirty year old female employees."
- 13. During the same period and until the present, CBRE's Philadelphia office, under Schleicher's supervision, has hired new employees who are all substantially younger than Plaintiff, and overwhelmingly female and younger than 40.

- 14. During the same period and until the present, Schleicher has authorized these younger employees to take training and had denied that training to older employees, including Plaintiff.
- 15. During the same period and until the present, Schleicher also refused to allow Plaintiff any administrative assistance until the client agreed to pay for it, although all other Senior Real Estate Managers working for him had it without that condition.
- 16. During the same period, Schleicher required Plaintiff to move his office several times without assistance, requiring him to pack up his things "and put them in [his] car."
- 17. In August, 2009, Schleicher confronted Plaintiff in the presence of Linda Applegate and threatened to fire him because his voicemail was full. During this meeting, Plaintiff reported Schleicher's statements about his age to Donna Hill of CBRE's Human Resources department.
- 18. On August 5, 2010, an attorney for the Plaintiff complained in writing to Donna Hill of age discrimination in his treatment by Schleicher and that this age discrimination reflected a preference for "twenty and thirty year old female employees."
- 19. During 2011, the Defendants initiated an investigation of Plaintiff, and accused him of misconduct because his name had been associated with his brother's business.
- 20. Thereafter, while continuing various of the other actions described previously, Schleicher accused the Plaintiff of causing a \$5,000 late fee from PECO, although he well knew the said accusation to be false.

- 21. In December 2011, CBRE, in a meeting announced for an entirely different purpose, surprised the Plaintiff and attempted to get him to say there was something wrong with his conduct that would have led to his name being identified with his brother's company, all in an effort to establish a basis for taking adverse action against him.
- 22. CBRE then changed Plaintiff's reporting relationship so that his new supervisor had a lower level title, although he still reported up through Schleicher.
 - 23. Plaintiff was terminated on February 28, 2012.
- 24. Schleicher aided and abetted CBRE in its adverse actions toward the Plaintiff.

ADMINISTRATIVE PREREQUISITES TO SUIT

- 25. Plaintiff filed a complaint alleging sex and age discrimination and retaliation against CBRE, a true copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission (PHRC), which was received by the agency on August 23, 2012 and assigned Docket Number 201200788.
- 26. The said complaint was cross filed as a charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) on the same date, and assigned EEOC Charge Number 17F201261877.
- 27. On October 31, 2013, the EEOC issued a Notice of Right to Sue to the Plaintiff in regard to the said complaint and charge, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

Unlawful Discrimination Under Title VII

- 28. The averments of paragraphs 1-27 are incorporated by reference.
- 29. Defendants' actions constitute unlawful discrimination based upon Plaintiff's sex in violation of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a)(1).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant legal and equitable relief against CBRE, including:

- a. injunctive relief against further acts of discrimination;
- b. back pay with interest;
- c. compensatory and punitive damages in an amount in excess of \$150,000; and
- d. reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

COUNT II

Unlawful Discrimination under the ADEA

- 30. The averments of paragraphs 1-27 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 31. Defendant's actions constitute unlawful discrimination based upon Plaintiff's age in violation of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. §631(a).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant legal and equitable relief against CBRA, including:

- a. injunctive relief against further acts of discrimination;
- b. back pay with interest;
- c. an additional equal amount of back pay as liquidated damages;

- d. compensatory damages in an amount in excess of \$150,000.00; and
- e. reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

COUNT III

Unlawful Discrimination in Violation of the PHRA, 43 P.S. §955

- 32. The averments of paragraphs 1 27 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 33. Defendant's actions constitute a violation of 43 P.S. § 955(a).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully request that this Honorable Court grant legal and equitable relief against both defendants, including:

- a. injunctive relief against further acts of discrimination;
- b. back pay with interest;
- c. compensatory damages in an amount in excess of \$150,000.00; and
- d. reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

COUNT IV

Unlawful Retaliation in Violation of Title VII

- 34. The averments of paragraphs 1-27 are incorporated by reference.
- 35. Defendants actions constitute a violation of 42 U.S.C. §2000e-3(a).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant legal and equitable relief against CBRE, including:

- a. injunctive relief against further acts of discrimination;
- b. back pay with interest;
- c. compensatory and punitive damages in an amount in excess of \$150,000; and
- d. reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

COUNT V

Unlawful Retaliation in Violation of the ADEA

- 33. The averments of paragraphs 1-27 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 34. Defendant's actions were unlawful retaliation in violation of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. §623(d).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant legal and equitable relief, including:

- a. injunctive relief against further acts of discrimination;
- b. back pay with interest;
- c. an additional equal amount of back pay as liquidated damages;
- d. compensatory damages in an amount in excess of \$150,000.00; and
- e. reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

COUNT VI

Unlawful Retaliation in Violation of the PHRA, 43 P.S. §955

- 35. The averments of paragraphs 1 27 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 36. Defendant's actions constitute a violation of 43 P.S. § 955(d).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully request that this Honorable Court grant legal and equitable relief, including:

- a. injunctive relief against further acts of discrimination;
- b. back pay with interest;
- c. compensatory damages in an amount in excess of \$150,000.00; and

d. reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

By:

William T Wilson (ID #41793) MacELREE HARVEY, LTD. 17 West Miner Street West Chester, PA 19382 (610) 436-0100

Attorney for Plaintiff

Exhibit A

1031437

AUG 2 3 2012

PA Human Relations Commission Philadelphia Regional Office

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

PENNSYLVANIA HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

CHARLES F. WARGO,

COMPLAINANT

v.

PHRC DOCKET NO: 201200788

EEOC CHARGE NO: 17F201261877

CBRE, INC.; and RICHARD SCHLEICHER and SAM DELISI RESPONDENT

COMPLAINT

1. The complainant is:

Charles F. Wargo 138 Barcladen Road Rosemont, PA 19010

2. The first respondent herein is:

CBRE, Inc. 2100 Ross Avenue, Suite 1600 Dallas, TX 75201

3. The second respondent herein is:

Richard Schleicher CBRE, Inc. Two Liberty Place, Suite 3000 50 S. 16th Street Philadelphia, PA 19102

4. The third respondent herein is:

Samuel Delisi CBRE, Inc. 311 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60606

I allege the respondents violated § 5 of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, as follows:

- 5. I was employed as Senior Real Estate Manager by the respondent CBRE, Inc (CBRE) in Philadelphia beginning in March 2005. I am 62 years old.
- 6. Respondent Richard Schleicher (Schleicher) was my direct supervisor beginning in 2006. Respondent Samuel Delisi (Delisi) was his supervisor.
- 7. During the period between the start of his said supervision and August, 2010, Schleicher made several statements to me to the effect that I would be retiring soon and that he did not know why I wanted to work at my age, and that the "future of CBRE is with twenty and thirty year old female employees.
- 8. During the same period and until the present, CBRE's Philadelphia office, under Schleicher and Delisi's supervision, has hired new employees who are all substantially younger than I am, and overwhelmingly female and younger than 40.
- 9. During the same period and until the present, Schleicher has authorized these younger employees to take training and has denied that training to older employees, including me.
- 10. During the same period and until the present, Schleicher also refused to allow me any administrative assistance until the client agreed to pay for it, although all other Senior Real Estate Managers working for him had it without that condition.
- 11. During the same period, Schleicher required me to move my office several times without assistance, requiring me to pack up my things "and put them in [my] car."
- 12. In August, 2009, Schleicher confronted me in the presence of Linda Applegate and threatened to fire me because my voicemail was full. During this meeting, I

- reported Schleicher's statements about my age to Donna Hill of CBRE's Human Resources department.
- On August 5, 2010, my attorney, Joyce Collier, complained in writing to Donna Hill of age discrimination in his treatment by Schleicher.
- During 2011, after I revealed instances of bid rigging by Schleicher, Delisi initiated an investigation of me, and accused me of misconduct because my name had been associated with my brother's business.
- 15. Thereafter, while continuing various of the other actions described previously, Schleicher attempted to make me responsible for a \$5,000 late fee from PECO, although he well knew the said fee to be in error, and CBRE does not normally pass on such liabilities to employees even if they are not in error.
- 16. In December 2011, CBRE closed its investigation of the bid rigging but, in a surprise meeting, attempted to get me to say there was something wrong with my conduct that would have led to my name being identified with my brother's company in an effort to establish a basis for taking adverse action against me.
- 17. CBRE then changed my reporting relationship so that my new supervisor had a lower level title, although I still reported up through Schleicher.
- 18. I was terminated on February 28, 2012.
- 19. The actions of Schleicher and Delisi aided and abetted CBRE in terminating me.

COUNT I - AGE DISCRIMINATION

20. I believe my termination was because of my age.

COUNT II - GENDER DISCRIMINATION

21. I believe my termination was because of my gender.

COUNT III - RETALIATION

523316

22. I believe my termination was in retaliation for my complaints, including the one sent by my attorney and those I made myself, about age discrimination.

I hereby request that the respondent be required to provide all appropriate remedies under Section 9 of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

I hereby verify that the statements contained in this complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C. S. Section 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

8-17-12-(Date signed)

CHARLES F. WARSO

(Complainant signature

Exhibit B

Case 2:13-cv-07442-LFR Document 1 Filed 12/19/13 Page 15 of 19

EEOC Form 161-B (11/09)	U.S. EQUAL EN	MPLOYMENT OPPORT	UNITY C	OMMISSION	
NOV 0,42013	NOTICE OF R	GHT TO SUE (ISS	UED ON	REQUEST)	
To: Charles Wargo 138 Barcladen Ro Rosemont, PA 19			From:	Philadelphia District Office 801 Market Street Suite 1300 Philadelphia, PA 19107	3
	person(s) aggrieved whose iden TIAL (29 CFR §1601.7(a))	itity is			
EEOC Charge No.	EEO	C Representative		Tele	phone No.
17F-2012-61877	Leg	al Unit		(21	5) 440-2828
Notice to the Person Ad	GRIEVED:	(-	See also l	the additional information end	losed with this form.)
Title VII of the Civil Rigi Act (GINA): This is your been issued at your requ	nts Act of 1964, the America Notice of Right to Sue, issued est. Your lawsuit under Title otice; or your right to sue bas	under Title VII, the ADA VII, the ADA or GINA m	or GINA	based on the above-numbered in a federal or state cour	ed charge. It has t WITHIN 90 DAYS
X More than	180 days have passed since	the filing of this charge.			
Less than be able to	180 days have passed since complete its administrative pr	he filing of this charge, I ocessing within 180 day	out I have s from the	determined that it is unlikely e filing of this charge.	that the EEOC will
X The EEOC	is terminating its processing	of this charge.			
	will continue to process this	1 12			
Age Discrimination in E 90 days after you receive your case:	mployment Act (ADEA): Yo notice that we have complete	u may sue under the AD ed action on the charge.	EA at any In this re	y time from 60 days after the gard, the paragraph marke	charge was filed unti d below applies to
X The EEOC 90 DAYS	is closing your case. Thereful of this Notice	ore, your lawsuit under t a. Otherwise, your right	he ADEA to sue ba	must be filed in federal or sed on the above-numbered	state court <u>WITHIN</u> charge will be lost.
The EEOC you may fil	is continuing its handling of y e suit in federal or state court	our ADEA case. Howev under the ADEA at this	ver, if 60 o time.	days have passed since the f	ling of the charge,
n federal or state court w	ou already have the right to su thin 2 years (3 years for willful arred more than 2 years (3 y	violations) of the alleged	EPA und	erpayment. This means that	uits must be brought backpay due for
f you file suit, based on th	is charge, please send a copy	of your court complaint	to this offic	ce.	
		On behalf of	the Com	mission	, 1
Enclosures(s)		00		X	10/31/13

_1101030163(3)

Spencer H. Lewis, Jr. District Director (Date Mailed)

CC:

William T. Wilson, Esquire, Counsel for Charging Party

James A. Keller, Esquire, Counsel for CBRE, Inc.

William T. Wilson, Esquire, Esq.
MacElree Harvey, Ltd.,
17 West Miner S Post Office Box 600
West Chester, PA 19381

James A. Keller, Esquire Saul Ewing, LLP Centre Square West 1500 Market Street, 38th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102-2186

CBRE INC

Case 2:13-cv-07442-LFR Document 1 Filed 12/19/13 Page 17 of 19

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet.

purpose of initiating the civil de					1974, 18 TCqtii	ired for the use of	the Clerk of Court for the	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS CHARLES F. WARGO				DEFENDANTS CBRE, INC. and RICHARD SCHLE				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Montgomery (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Philadelphia (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A WILLIAM T. WILSON, Ma 17 W. MINER ST., P.O. E (610) 436-0100	acELREE HARVEY, L	ŤD.	0660	Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for	Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)			TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri	incipal Place 🗇 4	() DEF □ 4
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		5
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation	 6	1 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			I Fr	ADEELT DE OFFILL TY	DAN	KDIIDTOV	OTHER STATISTICS	2
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 70 Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer, w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITIO Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	Y	CABOR LABOR Other LABOR Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Clabor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Emily and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Note Institute of the content of the c	422 Appe 423 With 28 U PROPE 820 Copy 830 Pater 840 Trade 861 HIA 862 Black 863 DIW 864 SSID 865 RSI (FEDER. 870 Taxe or D 871 IRS—26 U	RTY RIGHTS rrights tt emark SECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) 0 Title XVI 405(g)) AL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	OTHER STATUTE 375 False Claims Act 400 State Reapportion 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influence Corrupt Organizatie 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commod Exchange 890 Other Statutory Act 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Mat 895 Freedom of Informa Act 896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Pro- Act/Review or App Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	ed and ons lities/ tions ters ation
▼ 1 Original □ 2 Rer	cite the U.S. Civil Star Title VII of the 199	Appellate Court tute under which you as 64 Civil Rights Act,	re filing (4 42 USC		tutes unless di ADEA, 29	9 USC Sec. 62	23(d)	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION	v D	EMAND \$ 150,000.00	С		if demanded in complaint	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER		
DATE	2	SIGNATURE OF A	TORNEY	F RECORD				
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	2	11011	10		_			
RECEIPT# AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG: JUD	OGE	

Case 2:13-cv-07442-LFR Document 1 Filed 12/19/13 Page 18 of 19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

assignment to appropriate calendar.	
Address of Plaintiff: 138 Barcladen Road, Rosemont,	PA
Address of Defendant: Two Liberty Place, Suite 3000	, Philadelphia, PA
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Philadelphia, PA	
(Use Reverse Side For A	dditional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation at (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge	Yes□ No 反 Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year.	ear previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ No♥:
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior s action in this court?	uit pending or within one year previously terminated
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier n terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No⊠ numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes□ NoĞ
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	s case filed by the same individual? Yes No No
CIVIL: (Place 🗸 in one category only)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury
5. □ Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. 🗷 Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
8. Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERT (Check Appropriate Call, William T. Wilson, counsel of record do hereby certification)	ategory) y:
X Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; X Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
DATE: 12-17-13	41793
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	re has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court
except as noted above.	41700
DATE: 12-17-13 Attorney-at-Law	41793 Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CHARLES F.	WARGO		CIVIL ACTION		
	v.	•			
CBRE, INC. RICHARD SCH		(1) (3)	NO.		
plaintiff shall confiling the compla side of this form designation, that the plaintiff and a to which that def	mplete a Case Mar int and serve a cop n.) In the event the defendant shall, wall other parties, a rendant believes the	nagement Track Designation y on all defendants. (See § 1 nat a defendant does not ago with its first appearance, sub	action Plan of this court, counsel at Form in all civil cases at the time :03 of the plan set forth on the revergree with the plaintiff regarding samit to the clerk of court and serve resignation Form specifying the transport TRACKS:	of rse aid on	
		t under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 th)	
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.					
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.					
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)					
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.					
12 - 17 - Date (610) 436-0		Attorney-at-law .0) 430-7885	William T. Wilson Attorney for Plaintiff wwilson@macelree.co		
Telephone]	FAX Number	E-Mail Address		

(Civ. 660) 10/02